

## REMARKS

### Summary of Examiner's Action

In the subject office action, the Examiner

- rejected claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-32, and 39-49 under 35 USC 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Hunt et al (USP 6,496,855),
- rejected claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11 under 35 USC 103 in view of Hunt and Linden, and
- rejected claims 15-19, 33-38 and 50-55 under 35 USC 103 in view of Hunt and Kamiya.

### Rejections against claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-32, and 39-49 under 35 USC 102(e) based on Hunt ('855)

In response, Applicant has (without prejudice) canceled claim 8, and amended claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12, 24, 28 and 45 to more clearly distinguish the present invention over Hunt. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure, no new matters have been introduced.

### Claim 1

Amended claim 1 now recites in pertinent parts

*a user computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first web site;  
the user computer providing a first email address provided by an email service provider for use to register the user with said first web site;  
the user computer, on behalf of the user, registering the user with a second web site; and  
the user computer providing a second email address provided by the email service provider, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with said second web site.*

Thus, the method of claim 1 requires

- the computer registering with the web sites be **a user computer**,
- the separate and distinct email addresses provided by the user computer to the web sites are **received from an email service provider**.

Hunt, in contrast, teaches a proxy system for registering users with web sites, acting as agents of the users. Hunt's proxy system submits, on behalf of the users, the necessary registration data to the web sites (see e.g. col. 5, lines 34-36), including the email addresses. Accordingly, Hunt does not anticipate the required limitations of **a user computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first/second web site, and the user computer providing the first/second email addresses to the first/second web site**.

While Hunt's scheme includes the proxy system having the ability to provide "protected" email addresses (in lieu of the users' normal email addresses) to the web sites. However, since under Hunt's scheme, it is the proxy system which submits the email addresses to the web sites, and emails from the web sites addressed to the users using these email addresses are automatically re-routed to the users' "normal" email addresses by the proxy system, Hunt does not anticipate the required limitations of the email addressed provided by the user computer to the web sites be **received from an email service provider**.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Hunt, and patentable over Hunt.

#### Claim 21

Original claim 21 contains similar limitations as amended claim 1, requiring the e-device to obtain a number of email addresses from an email service provider, select the email addresses from these obtained email addresses for use to communicate with various communication partners or groups of communication

partners. As discussed earlier, none of these limitations is anticipated by Hunt. Accordingly, original claim 21 is patentable over Hunt.

Claim 24

Original claim 24 contains similar limitations as original claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the same reason, original claim 24 is patentable over Hunt.

Claim 28

Original claim 28 recites the same limitations of original claims 21 and 24, from the email service provider's perspective. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, original claim 28 is patentable over Hunt.

Claims 39 and 41

Original claims 39 and 41 contain similar limitations as original claims 21 and 24. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, original claims 39 and 41 are patentable over Hunt.

Claim 45

Original claim 45 recites the same limitations of original claim 28. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, original claim 45 is patentable over Hunt.

Claims 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20, 22-23, 25-27, 29-32, 40, 42-44, and 46-49

Claims 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20, 22-23, 25-27, 29-32, 40, 42-44, and 46-49 depend on claim 1, 21, 24, 28, 39, 41 or 45, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20, 22-23, 25-27, 29-32, 40, 42-44, and 46-49 are patentable over Hunt.

103 rejections against claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 11

Rejection of claim 8 has been rendered moot by its cancellation.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 10 and 11 depend on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Linden does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Hunt. Thus, for at

least the same reasons, claims 2, 4, 7, 10 and 11 are not obvious, and patentable over Hunt, even when combined with Linden.

103 rejections against claims 15-19, 33-38 and 50-55

Claims 15-19 depend on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Kamiya does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Hunt. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 15-19 are not obvious, and patentable over Hunt, even when combined with Kamiya.

Further, in rejecting claim 16, the Examiner reasoned that Kamiya at col. 4 lines 3-10 and col. 9, lines 38-51, teaches the required limitation of further organizing the emails received for an email address based on whether received emails addressed to the email address are sent by the intended web site or not. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

At col. 4, lines 3-10, Kamiya merely disclosed first and second collectors having first and second collector addresses may be used as first and second email inboxes. Collector addresses are URLs (see col. 4, lines 55-56).

Col. 9, lines 38-51 merely disclosed the employment of links linking collectors in further detail. Links are used to automatically transfer information between collectors (see e.g. abstract).

Thus, there is no teachings in either Hunt or Kamiya on first organizing emails received for a user by the user's multiple email addresses, and additionally, for each email address, further organized by whether the emails were sent by the intended communication partner web site of the email address or not.

As described and explained in the specification, the feature provides the user with a powerful ability to easily delete all emails from other senders who managed to acquired the email address, including purchasing or inappropriately gleamed from

the intended communication partner, the web site. The problem addressed by this feature is neither appreciated by Hunt nor Kamiya.

Claims 33, 35, 50 and 52 all include the above discussed limitation of organizing received emails for an email address based on intended or unintended communication partner (web site). As discussed above, neither Hunt nor Kamiya teaches the limitation. Thus, claims 33, 35, 50 and 52 are patentable over Hunt and Kamiya combined.

Claims 34, 36-38, 51, 53-55 depend on claims 33, 35, 50 and 52 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 34, 36-38, 51, 53-55 are patentable over Hunt and Kamiya combined.


#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7, and 9-55 are in condition for allowance, and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt

25  
Date: August 28, 2003  
Aa

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aloysius AuYeung, Reg. No. 35,432  
Attorney for Applicant